

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the Claims**

Claim 1 is amended in this RCE; claims 2-4 and 6-13 are original; claims 16-19 are new; and claims 5, 14, and 15 are canceled.

**II. Claim Amendments**

Claim 1 is amended by inserting two additional steps: (a) providing a multilayer film, and (b) heating the film at a temperature below its melting point. These amendments are supported by the original specification. Support for step (a) can be found in the Detailed Description of the Invention, page 6, lines 25-31. Support for step (b) can be found in the Detailed Description of the Invention, page 7, lines 1-9.

Support for new claim 16 can be found in the Detailed Description of the Invention, page 7, lines 10-14. Support for new claims 17-19 can be found in the Detailed Description of the Invention, page 8, lines 1-7.

**III. Remaining Claims are Patentable over *Farley et al.* (WO 01/98409)**

As Applicant argued in the response filed on April 17, 2007, *Farley et al.* does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention. Applicant claims a machine-direction orientation (MDO) of a multilayer film, a post-treatment of a multilayer film after the multilayer film is manufactured. *Farley et al.* does not disclose MDO of multilayer film. Instead *Farley et al.* teaches a chill roll casting process, and a blown film process for manufacturing multilayer films, pg. 34, lines 26 - 35. In the casting process the polymers are co-extruded into a multilayer film by forcing the polymers through a die gap opening (600 microns), and drawing down the film to a final gauge (20 microns). The draw-down ratio disclosed in the reference that the examiner relies on in the rejection (21:1) is based on the ratio of the die opening (600 microns) to the final film thickness (20 microns).

It is the Examiner's position in the Advisory Action dated June 1, 2007 that Applicant imported the above argument from the specification. According to the telephone message from the Examiner to Applicant's attorney, Shao-Hua Guo on June 5, 2007, Applicant understands that the Examiner will withdraw the rejection if Applicant amends the claims by incorporating limitations indicating the claimed method is for post treating a multilayer film which has been produced and stretched during the film production process. Therefore, Applicant files this RCE and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to telephone his attorney, Shao-Hua Guo, at (610) 359-2455 if a discussion of the application might be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,  
D. Ryan Breese

By: *Shao-Hua Guo*

Shao-Hua Guo  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 44,728  
Lyondell Chemical Company  
Phone: (610) 359-2455  
June 12, 2007

**Customer Number: 24114**